



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

HL

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/514,999	02/29/2000	Yoshihiro Tanimoto	KODA20A.001AUS	1582
20995	7590	09/29/2004	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP			MARX, IRENE	
2040 MAIN STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FOURTEENTH FLOOR				
IRVINE, CA 92614			1651	

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/514,999	TANIMOTO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Irene Marx	1651	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
 THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/13/04

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 2-8, 10-12, 14 and 15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 2-8, 10-12 and 14-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 2-8, 10-12 and 14-15 are being considered on the merits.

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9/7/04 has been entered.

The use of the trademark names of nucleases has been noted in this application. They should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 2-8, 10-12 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 10 and 14 are vague, indefinite and confusing in the recitation "of increasing the yield of polyamines recovered in a subsequent recovery step by approximately 2-3.2 times the yield of polyamines recovered in the subsequent recovery step without this decomposition step". This issue was queried previously because the phrase as written appears incomplete or grammatically incorrect. Do applicants mean "for increasing...". Also, in the present context the meaning of this phrase is confusing because as claim designated, the recitation does not specifically and distinctly claim that this amount is, in fact, recovered in the process

Claims 10 and 14 are confusing and vague in the recitation of concentration of nucleases rather than the activity thereof.

Claim 11 is confusing in the use of nucleases which are not specific for RNA such as deoxyribonuclease I.

Claims 10 and 14 are substantial duplicates.

Claim 15 is confusing in the recitation of "to a degree achieved when the yeast-RNA containing composition is treated". A positive process step such as --treating the yeast-RNA composition for about 15-18 hours...-- would be remedial.

Claim 11 is vague and indefinite in the recitation of trademarks to denote the enzymes intended to be used in the process. The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. In fact, the value of a trademark would be lost to the extent that it became descriptive of a product, rather than used as an identification of a source or origin of a product. Thus, the use of a trademark or trade name in a claim to identify or describe a material or product would not only render a claim indefinite, but would also constitute an improper use of the trademark or trade name. "To describe physical or other properties of material by mere use of **trademark** is objectionable since it has tendency to make trademark descriptive of product rather than leaving trademark to serve its traditional purpose which is to identify product's source of origin". The issue involved the use of the Trademark **Hypalon** in the claims which Appellants have argued to be within the guidelines of M.P.E.P. 608.01 (v) if the meaning of the trademark is well known and satisfactorily defined in the literature. Copies of articles were submitted. No rejection was made based on first paragraph of 35 USC 112 which was correct but the rejection was on second paragraph which was considered to be correct by the board. "A patent applicant has an obligation that is imposed by 35 USC 112, second paragraph, to employ claim terminology which is definitive of what the public is not free to use, and use of a trademark in the manner employed by appellant has resulted in claims which fail to meet this obligation in our opinion.: see *Ex parte Simpson and Roberts* 218 USPQ 1020.

Claims 4-5 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form.

Claims 2-8, 10-12 and 14-15 would be allowable upon resolution of all 35 U.S.C § 112 issues. There would have been no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify processes of obtaining polyamine compositions by treating an RNA containing yeast composition for approximately 15-18 hours in solution with a nuclease added in a concentration

Art Unit: 1651

of approximately 1-2 mg/ml, at approximately 25-37°C, and at a pH of approximately 6-8, or with a 0.3 N alkali solution at 37°C at the time the claimed invention was made.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Irene Marx whose telephone number is (571) 272-0919. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-3:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Wityshyn can be reached on (571) 272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Irene Marx
Irene Marx
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1651